IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE TWENTY THIRD DAY OF AUGUST
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE Dr. JUSTICE G.YETHIRAJULU

WRIT PETITION No. 19298 of 1994

Between:

D.Ramanjaneyulu S/o.D.R.Obulesu
Tungamat Weaving Centre Munimadugu
Ananthapur Dist.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Manaigng Director Handicrafts Dept Corporation Limited.,
(A.P.State Govt.under Taking) Taramandal 3rd floor
Saifabad Hyderabad.
2 The Dist Manager Lepakshi Handicrafts Emporium
Subhash Road Ananthapur.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in not regularizing the services of the petitioners in terms of G.O.Ms.No.212, Finance & Planning (FW.PC-III) Dt.22-4-1994, who has put in more than 8 years service and was in service as on 25-11-1993, is illegal, arbitrary, capricious and mala fide.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MRSYED SHAREEF AHMED

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: MR.Y.VENKAT SASTRY

Counsel for the Respondent No.2: Smt.A.ANASUYA

The Court made the following:

–

–

ORDER:

The petitioner worked as a Watchman in the respondent Corporation under a scheme with effect from 07.04.1986 on a daily wage at Rs.15/-. The petitioner contended that the 1st respondent called for particulars from him for regularization of service, in pursuance of his representation dated 28.10.1992 and 30.10.1992. He gave full particulars as required by the 1st respondent.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is that no orders have been passed by the 1st respondent till the date of filing of this writ petition. The writ petition was filed in the year 1994.

3. The learned counsel for the respondent represented that the unit, in which the petitioner worked, was closed in pursuance of abolition of the scheme, and the petitioner left the service immediately after the closure of the unit, and he is no more working in any capacity in the respondent Corporation.

4. In the light of the circumstances, explained by the respondent, the writ petition became infructuous. In the event of the petitioner continuing in the service of the respondent Corporation, he is at liberty to make a representation, expressing his grievance regarding his regularization of service.

5. The Writ Petition is, accordingly, dismissed as infructuous.

dsr/svs

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

// TRUE COPY //

SECTION OFFICER

To:

1. The Managing Director,

Handicrafts Development Corporation Limited,

(A.P.State Government undertaking)

Taramanda 3rd floor, Saifabad, Hyderabad

2. The District Manager,

Lepakshi Handicrafts Emporium,

Subhash Road, Anantapur

3. Two CD copies.